

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed December 13, 2007. Claims 1-10, 12-24 and 26-35 are pending in this application. This Amendment amends claims 1, 4, 15, 18, 29, 30, and 35, and cancels 6 and 20. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is respectfully requested.

Applicant-Initiated Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner for granting an interview dated 4/08/2008, where arguments were discussed generally. The Examiner expressed that "converting...to a strict formatted file" can be taught by copying the data and that when copied, the data has a common format.

I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-3, 5, 8-10, 12-17, 19, 22-24 and 26-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Maslov (U.S. Patent No. 6,583,673) (hereinafter "Maslov"). Applicants respectfully submit that Maslov does not disclose each element of the amended claims.

For example, Applicants' claim 1, as amended, recites a method for monitoring multiple online resources in different formats, the method comprising the steps of:

identifying a plurality of online resources to monitor, the plurality of online resources being stored in a plurality of formats, at least one of the plurality of online resources including data in a non-strict architectural structure;

identifying whether each of the online resources of the plurality of online resources is a non-HyperText Markup Language application;

for each of the plurality of online resources from the non-HyperText Markup Language application, converting the online resource from the non-HyperText Markup Language application to a HyperText Markup Language application;

for each of the online resources of the plurality of online resources, determining whether the online resource meets a minimum level of content structure to allow an Extensible Style Sheet Transform to be used to convert the online resource to the strict formatted file;

converting each of the plurality of online resources that is determined as meeting the minimum level of content structure to a strict formatted file having a common format, wherein the strict formatted file is an Extensible Markup Language application, wherein data in the plurality of formats of the plurality of online resources is converted into a strict architectural structure;

converting each of the plurality of online resources that is determined as not meeting the minimum level of content structure to a strict formatted file, wherein the strict formatted file is a document object model of the online resource;
after converting to the strict formatted file, identifying relevant data in each of the strict formatted files based on the strict architectural structure of the data using an analytic parser; and
comparing the identified relevant data to a most recent archived copy of the identified relevant data to determine whether the identified relevant data has been altered. (emphasis added).

Applicants submit that several of the features recited in claim 1 are not taught or suggested by Maslov.

For example, claim 1 specifically recites, "for each of the online resources of the plurality of online resources, determining whether the online resource meets a minimum level of content structure to allow an Extensible Style Sheet Transform to be used to convert the online resource to the strict formatted file," "converting each of the plurality of online resources that is determined as meeting the minimum level of content structure to a strict formatted file having a common format, wherein the strict formatted file is an Extensible Markup Language application," and "converting each of the plurality of online resources that is determined as not meeting the minimum level of content structure to a strict formatted file, wherein the strict formatted file is a document object model of the online resource." Applicants submit that at least these features recited in claim 1 are not taught by Maslov.

Maslov discloses the extraction of digests of structured online documents, and automatic monitoring of the digests. Maslov also describes that "XSLT language that is used to write programs that transform XML documents to HTML documents...these techniques do not cover the present invention because they are used to synthesize lower level document presentation from the higher level document presentation but they do not change the content of the document. The present invention is primarily used to change the content of the document." (Maslov, col. 3, lines 25-36). "The preferred embodiment, of this invention uses DOM as a source document tree model. Other embodiments of this invention can use different tree models for representing the source document." (Maslov, col. 8, lines 17-20).

Maslov describes source online documents are transformed into target documents using a generated Script. Using the DOM (or other tree model of the source document), the user-selected fragment is located and is copied into the target document digest. There is no mention

or suggestion of converting the source online document to an XML application or to a DOM, based on a determination of whether the source online document meets a minimum level of content structure, as is recited in claim 1. As such, Applicants submit that at least these features are not taught by Maslov.

Moreover, claim 1 specifically recites, "after converting to the strict formatted file, identifying relevant data in each of the strict formatted files based on the strict architectural structure of the data using an analytic parser." Applicants submit that this feature recited in claim 1 is not taught by Maslov.

Maslov discloses that a script that performs online document transformation is created. This sample script transforms the source document 10 at FIG.2 to the target document 40. Maslov discloses how the transformation is performed. First user selects a source document fragment using a pointing device and selects the "Copy" command. When the "Copy" command is selected, the transformation script downloads the source document and transforms its fragment into the fragment in the target document. (Maslov, col. 8, lines 30-67). Second, the Script is created. In particular, "the WebTransformer creates a script that records the source document location, sequence of document tree navigation commands that leads from the tree root to the node that corresponds to the selected fragment, and the "Copy Fragment" command." (Maslov, col. 5, lines 62-67). Third, the user asks the Script to be executed.

The Examiner asserts that the feature of "converting each of the online resources to a strict formatted file," as recited in claim 1, is taught by Maslov. In particular, the Examiner asserts that the DOM is used to convert or transform the source document to a reformatted digest in a target window. (Office Action, pgs. 2 and 8). Even if, for purposes of argument, the reformatted digest is considered to be the equivalent to an online resource that has been converted to a strict formatted file, Applicants submit that Maslov fails to teach or suggest "after converting to the strict formatted file, identifying relevant data in each of the strict formatted files" based on the strict architectural structure of the data in the strict formatted files using an analytic parser," as recited in claim 1. Maslov describes that

"Script execution results in fresh (not from cache) download of the source document, navigating the source document tree to the selected tree node and copying the selected source document fragment to the target window." (Maslov, col. 6, lines 9-13). Execution of the sequence of commands contained in the script, causes "the source document(s) to be downloaded from the Internet, and fragment(s) of these documents to be selected and copied to the target window." (Maslov, col. 9, lines 55-60). Moreover, to be able to find the user-selected fragment of the source online document, the document model is used in the script. (Maslov, col. 10, lines 26-28). The script includes a sequence of "Go To Child" commands that goes from the downloaded treeroot to the document tree node that represents the document fragment selected by the user. (Maslov, col. 9, lines 1-5).

Maslov clearly describes that when the Script is run, the script first downloads the source document, second, locates the user selected fragment from the downloaded source document, and lastly, copies the fragment into the target window, thus producing the reformatted digest (i.e., the converted online resource, as suggested by Examiner). The Script locates the fragment (i.e., relevant data, as suggested) from the source document. It should be recognized that the source document is not an online resource which has been converted into a strict formatted file. Accordingly, Maslov does not teach or suggest "identifying relevant data in each of the strict formatted files," as recited in claim 1. In other words, Maslov describes that identification of the fragment occurs before, not after, any conversion occurs. Accordingly, Maslov does not teach or suggest "after converting to the strict formatted file, identifying relevant data," as recited in claim 1. Regardless of whether the Script is replayed or not, in no case does Maslov teach the features of claim 1. Each time the Script is executed, a search for the document fragment is performed on a fresh downloaded copy of the source document. Even when the Script is run again, the source document is again downloaded and then a search for the fragment is performed. It is not until after the fragment is located, does the Script copy/transform the source into the reformatted digest or target document. Thus, in Maslov, identification of fragment (i.e., relevant data, as suggested) occurs before the fragment is transformed into the reformatted digest. There is no processing that occurs on the reformatted digest after it has been created. Thus, Maslov fails to teach or suggest "after converting to the strict formatted file, identifying relevant data in each of the strict formatted files based on the strict architectural structure of the data in the strict formatted files using an analytic parser," as recited in claim 1.

Maslov does not anticipate Applicants' claim 1, or the claims that depend therefrom. Independent claims 15, 29, 30, and 35 recite limitations that similarly are not taught by Maslov. Thus, Maslov does not anticipate claims 15, 29, 30, and 35 or the claims that depend therefrom. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn with respect to these claims.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 4, 6, 7, 18, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Maslov and further in view of Helgeson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,643,652) (hereinafter "Helgeson"). Claims 4, 6, 7, 18, 20 and 21 depend from claims 1 or 15, which as discussed above are not rendered obvious by Maslov. Helgeson does not make up for the deficiencies in Maslov with respect to claims 1 or 15.

Helgeson teaches mapping between a specific local format and a generic interchange format (col. 2, lines 51-67). Helgeson is cited as teaching "converting from the non-hypertext markup language application to a hypertext markup language application" (Office Action, p. 6). Helgeson does not suggest, however, determining whether the online resource meets a minimum level of content structure, converting each of the plurality of online resources that is determined as meeting the minimum level of content structure, converting each of the plurality of online resources that is determined as not meeting the minimum level of content structure to a strict formatted file, and after converting to the strict formatted file, identifying relevant data in each of the strict formatted files based on the strict architectural structure of the data in the strict formatted files using an analytic parser, as required by Applicants' claims 1 and 15. Neither does Helgeson nor Maslov provide motivation for providing such functionality, and even if the references were combined for sake of argument the result would not arrive at the invention recited in Applicants' claim 1.

As Maslov and Helgeson fail to teach or suggest the elements of these claims, claims 1 and 15 cannot be rendered obvious by Maslov and Helgeson either alone or in combination. As claims 4, 6, 7, 18, 20, and 21 depend from claims 1 or 15, neither can these claims be rendered

obvious. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection with respect to claims 4, 6, 7, 18, 20, and 21 be withdrawn.

III. Amendment to the Claims

Unless otherwise specified, amendments to the claims are made for purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof. The amendments are supported by the specification and do not add new matter. For example, Applicants direct the Examiner to Fig. 3 of the application as filed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,
/ Naya M. Chatterjee-Marathe/

Naya M. Chatterjee-Marathe
Reg. No. 54,680

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
Attachments
NMC:pas
61246168 v1